

The Builder.

No. CCCCXCH.

SATURDAY, JULY 10, 1852.

IN all sides there is an outcry against the formation of the METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET in Copenhagen-fields, as we expected there would be as soon as the determination became known. Without meaning any disrespect, we must say that the Home Secretary of State has not done his duty in the matter. Under any ordinary Act of Parliament notice would probably have been required, which would have brought the intention prominently before the public, and would have enabled those who were interested to object in time. In the present case the public were supposed to be protected as to the selection of a fitting site by requiring in the Act that it should be approved of by one of her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State: there is no other protection whatever against the removal of the present market to Finsbury-circus or the Artillery-ground, or any other nice open site in the neighbourhood, if the Corporation could quietly buy it; and yet, when a deputation of gentlemen interested in the Camden estate urged upon the Home Secretary, that it could not have been the intention of the Legislature that the Secretary of State should give a mere formal assent to the site selected by the corporation of the City of London, but that he should exercise his right of approval more as a judicial than as a Ministerial act, and inquire into the propriety of fixing the market on any given site before signifying his approval of it,—Mr. Walpole objected to that view of the question, and said, it would be impossible for any Secretary of State to take upon himself judicial powers, examine witnesses, and make such a survey of the site as it would entail. Why, then, was his approval required? The preamble of the Removal Act sets forth that it is expedient a new market "should be provided in a more suitable place, more distant from the centre of the metropolis;" and a clause provides, as we mentioned last week, that after the market has been formed as authorized by the Act, no new market for the sale of cattle shall be opened at any place distant less than seven miles, in a straight line from St. Paul's. There is no restriction whatever as to the site of the market to be opened under the Act, except the veto of the Secretary of State, and now the honourable gentleman says he gave his assent as a matter of course, or, at all events, had written a letter, which he thought morally compelled him to assent when called upon, and was "afraid," according to the published report of the proceedings at the interview, that he could not retract. The honourable gentleman admitted that the Act was very arbitrary in permitting the selection of the site, without either the production of plans to the House of Commons, or notice in the *Gazette*, or any intimation whatever to the inhabitants of the neighbourhood, and yet he omitted to exercise the power confided to him for the protection of

the public. The Home Secretary evidently sees the error he has committed, and should take all the means in his power to remedy the oversight. It was pointed out to him by the deputation alluded to that a church had been built, squares commenced closely adjoining the proposed site, and that the land is already, indeed, surrounded by a population almost as dense as the neighbourhood from which it was proposed to remove the market; with this distinction, that, whereas the inhabitants in the neighbourhood of Smithfield had principally chosen their residence there in consequence of its contiguity to the market, as convenient for their business, those residing in the neighbourhood of Copenhagen-fields had chosen it in consequence of its being a respectable and ornamental neighbourhood, and in the full conviction that they would not be disturbed by the establishment of a nuisance almost at their very doors.

Mr. Dunhill, who, in 1847, began to advocate the removal of Smithfield Market to Copenhagen-fields, has called upon us to insert a long defence of the proposition in reply to the letter on the subject in our last week's paper, but this we are unable to do. There is the less reason for it, inasmuch as the writer admits fully the impropriety of adopting this site, except as a matter of expediency and a choice of evils. He says:—

"The proximity of Copenhagen-fields to a populous section of the metropolis is urged as an insuperable objection, and I am free to confess, except for other considerations, no one would, in sober seriousness, have proposed a mere transfer of the market to that site as a remedy for the evils of the ancient nuisance, well knowing that the whole population would rejoice to be relieved entirely from a huge live cattle market in any suburb, however distant; and when called before the Royal Commission, in 1850, I submitted a project for effecting this desirable termination to the monopolies and abuses of Smithfield.

My proposition was, that Smithfield market should be abolished, and any new establishment within a ten-mile radius should be forbidden; it so happening that nearly in the direction of the four cardinal points of the compass, at that distance from London, are located the nearest existing cattle markets, viz. Barnet, Romford, Croydon, and Southall, each situate on main trunk lines of railway, and now largely attended by London butchers. Indeed, the majority of the trade would economise both time and money by attending these markets; their distance apart and distinctive character avoiding the objections advanced against a plurality of markets.

The transmigration of cattle to convenient abattoirs in the immediate suburbs of the metropolis would be safe, expeditious, and economical, so that carcasses only would have to be conveyed through the streets to the butchers' shops, or to a grand central dead meat market, established at Smithfield on a scale commensurate with its importance.

Less comprehensive measures may never be regarded as absolutely permanent by future generations; nevertheless, while propounding this scheme to the commissioners with the conviction that the principles upon which it is based must ultimately obtain, the experience of many years' war waged against close monopolies and class interests, forbade me to exclude another conviction,—that to effect anything, the cosmopolitan view must for the nonce be ignored, and present concessions made to confirmed habits and inveterate prejudices."

This view of it we cannot admit. The metropolis must not be satisfied with a half measure in such a case, and this now proposed by the Corporation is not a half measure nor a quarter measure; it is simply a shifting of the nuisance. Those citizens who in 1380 petitioned that the butchers might be forced to kill their beasts at "Knyghtsbrigg" (Knightsbridge), or some other place equally distant from the city, looked a great deal further into the future than those who would now remove the nuisance of Smithfield into Copen-

hagen-fields, surrounded on all sides by houses and towards which the town tide is unquestionably setting in.

Bow Common, suggested by the deputation as a proper site, though less objectionable than Copenhagen-fields, is less advisable than the level opposite Woolwich Reach, mentioned by a correspondent last week. At the end of last year Mr. Charles Wilson, an engineer, published a pamphlet, with plans, recommending this position, and urging wisely that we should reject any half measure which might suffice for to-day, and establish a market on a scale worthy of the metropolis now, and sufficient to meet the views and wants of the generations that are to follow. We have ourselves no wish to advocate the adoption of any particular site: our object is simply to declare strenuously against the formation of the market in Copenhagen-fields. We have much greater faith than some of our contemporaries in the good intentions and ability of the Corporation of London and their officers, and are disposed to hope that, hearing of the overwhelming objections to the site named, they will reconsider the question, and prevent the necessity for such an interference on the part of the public as should otherwise be invited.

GREEK PERIPTERAL ARCHITECTURE AND ECCLESIASTICAL DESIGN.

THERE can be no doubt that nations in primitive times and southern climates resorted for worship to the depths of woods, nor that, led by the solemnity of such localities, they built their earliest temples in groves. When temples came afterwards to be raised in towns, and on a greater scale of magnificence, the colonnade, which may be looked upon as a petrification of the original line of trees of the sylvan situation (its æsthetic type) was extensively used. This, in the opinion of Wren, was the origin of the portico as an adjunct to the temple; an opinion that is not without support: the Indian and Chinese pagodas have each their peristylar accompaniments; and the adytum or sanctuary of the Egyptians was approached through a forest of columns. Nor was the fore-Christian Church, the Temple of Solomon, without them. And this columnar ordonnance, though only brought to perfection by the Athenians, may be viewed as the joint result of the geometric skill and art-feeling of Greeks, Egyptians, and all other imaginative and ingenious nations preceding them.

Another cause, doubtless, contributed to this appropriation of the peristyle, viz. its intrinsic beauty and grandeur: the shrine of religion was deemed in every nation the most important building: David took shame to himself that he should "dwell in a house of cedar" while the Ark of God dwelt "between certains;" and this sentiment could not fail to result in the most powerful elements being sought for its construction and embellishment. Nevertheless, the chief reason, as I conceive, was its peculiar expressional fitness, and the classical and other ancient nations used it under a sense of its entire and exclusive capacity for exciting those solemn emotions that should attend the worship of the divinity.

Besides, the peripteral arrangement or entire surrounding of the temple with columns, expressed to them a state of being set apart,—cut off from the world and devoted to an appointed use. They would naturally wish to give the sanctuary a distinct air, unlike all adjacent buildings; and nothing would do this like the enveloping porticoes. The most striking structural object on earth is a Greek temple. In such a building the colonnade is really a feature of utility, separating the house of God from others, and proclaiming it as holy. How impressive, how affecting, even its ruins at the present day: at Paestum, the traveller of sensibility feels as on sacred ground, and owns "the religion of the place." Why have these qualities been disregarded by eccle-